UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,080	05/11/2007	Benjamin L. Miller	176/61642	9764
26774 7590 09/19/2008 NIXON PEABODY LLP - PATENT GROUP 1100 CLINTON SQUARE POCLUSTED NY 14604			EXAMINER	
			BABIC, CHRISTOPHER M	
ROCHESTER, NY 14604			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1637	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/572,080	MILLER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	CHRISTOPHER M. BABIC	1637				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	-					
<i>;</i> —	/ 					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pane Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 455 C.G. 215.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-56</u> is/are pending in the application	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-56</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	election requirement					
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-56</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	of the certified copies not receive 4)	(PTO-413) te				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-23, drawn to a method of detecting presence of an otolaryngologic pathogen in a biological sample.

Group II, claim(s) 24-56, drawn to a oligonucleotide, sensor chip thereof, and sensor device thereof.

The inventions listed as groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

A sensor chip comprising a substrate having two or more nucleic acid probes respectively confined to two or more distinct locations thereon, the nucleic acid probes hybridizing to a target nucleic acid of an otolaryngologic pathogen under suitable hybridization conditions, wherein the two or more probes are selected to hybridize, collectively, to target nucleic acids of two or more otolaryngologic pathogens was known in the art at the time of invention as demonstrated by Brennan (U.S. 5,474,796; col. 9,

example 4; Brennan teaches the production of a solid support comprising immobilized extendable oligonucleotides that represent <u>every possible permutation</u> of the 10-mer oligonucleotide and thus necessarily includes two distinct probes capable of hybridizing two otolaryngologic pathogens, i.e. probes that are completely complementary).

The said product cannot therefore be considered a special technical feature, as lack of unity rules hold that a feature known to a person of ordinary skill in the art makes no advance over the prior art.

Claims 21, 36, 51, and 54 contain the following patentably distinct combination of oligonucleotide sequences:

Combination of probes (SEQ ID NOs 1-22)

Each combination of markers comprise a patentably distinct combination of oligonucleotide sequences. Each combination is patentably distinct because they comprise a group of structurally different sequences drawn to different otolarynologic pathogen. Thus, a further restriction is applied to the group. Applicants must elect a single combination of sequences for examination on the merits.

The above restriction practice is supported by MPEP 803.04, example (C), wherein the section states:

"Applications containing only composition claims reciting different combination of individual nucleotide sequences...will be subject to a restriction requirement. Applicants will be required to select one combination for examination. If the selected combination contains ten or fewer sequences, all of the sequences of the combination will be searched. If the selected combination contains more than ten sequences, the combination will be examined following the procedures set forth above for example (B)."

Example (B) states that the presence of one novel and non-obvious sequence within the combination will render the entire combination free of prior art (MPEP 803.04).

In summary, applicants must elect a <u>single</u> combination of probe sequences for examination on the merits. Applicant is respectfully requested, in order to help facilitate examination, to identify the sequences within the combination which are least likely to be found in the prior art.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims

Art Unit: 1637

and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

Art Unit: 1637

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher M. Babic whose telephone number is 571-272-8507. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/572,080

Page 7

Art Unit: 1637

/Christopher M. Babic/ Patent Examiner Technology Center 1600 Art Unit 1637